

have a lot of merit and then let these other people try to offer their amendment to his bill. That is the logical thing. But I believe if you have listened to the discussion, you all know the issues that are involved here today, not just the issue of criminal mischief, and remember this, if it hasn't been brought out already, some of these acts of vandalism are not a matter of money. That is not what the people who brought the bill are upset about. A swastika could be made, it could be written in a substance made from flour and water, which you could spray water on and dissolve away. The money is not the issue at all. That is not the basis for the bill. It is the insult, the sacrilege, the bad quality of the acts themselves which the bill is attempting to address. That is what I think the Legislature should be discussing. If the Judiciary Committee really meant what some of its members have said they mean and that this is a bad bill, the bill should have been killed as they killed the ethnic intimidation bill. They didn't try to clean that up and put a stiffer punishment in the aspects of the statutes that deal with assault, intimidation, terroristic threats and the rest of it. They left that just like it is because if you intimidate or harass somebody because of his or her ethnicity, that is not such a bad thing. So you don't strengthen the statutes that deal with those kind of offenses as they exist now. You killed that bill. But when we come to buildings, then the Judiciary Committee has to scramble around and try to do the sleight of hand that it is attempting to get you to go along with here this morning. They should have killed the bill, but they should have killed it for the right reason. Now if somebody takes a lawnmower and cuts a swastika into the lawn of a synagogue or some other facility which they have identified with Jewish people or the Jewish faith, suppose the only thing you have to do to obliterate that swastika is to cut all of the grass, then somebody with the kind of sensitivity we have in Nebraska might say, well, golly, I don't see what you are upset about, the one who put the swastika in there got your grass cut for you. You wouldn't have cut it as fast if they hadn't done that. That is the way these issues are dealt with often. The term "sensitivity" is too freely attached to the actions of the Legislature.

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: To simply acknowledge that a problem exists does not show sensitivity. The sensitivity is demonstrated by a manifestation of understanding of how that problem impacts on the people who face it and then try to do something to try to help alleviate the problem. That is what sensitivity means. Perception is not sensitivity. So I think you ought